

Application Serial No. 10/672,508
Attorney Docket No. 60001.0396US01/MS303915.1

REMARKS

Reconsideration and continued examination of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1-20 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 5, 9, and 13 are independent. In the Final Office Action dated April 7, 2006, Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Following this response, Claims 1-22 remain in this application with Claims 21 and 22 being added by this amendment. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

Substance of Interview Summary

A telephonic interview occurred between the undersigned, Murrell Blackburn and Examiner Amelia L. Rutledge on Friday, July 7, 2006. The interview covered the rejections to Claims 1-4 and 15-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over CAST Bobby: Manual for Downloadable Version 2000, (hereinafter "*Bobby*"), copyright 1996-2000 Center for Applied Special Technology (CAST), in view of Duggan et al. (hereinafter "*Duggan*"), U.S. Patent No. 6,002,871, issued December 1999. The interview also covered the rejection to Claims 5-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) were rejected as being unpatentable over *Bobby* in view of Nentwich et al. (hereinafter "*Nentwich*"), xlinkit: A Consistency Checking and Smart Link Generation Service, ACM Transactions on Internet Technology, Vol. 2, No. 2, May 2002, p. 151-185.

The undersigned pointed out to the Examiner that Amended Claim 5 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "presenting the analysis data to an application program to correct a definable error in the hypertext document." Amended Claims 1, 9, and 13 each includes a similar recitation.

The Examiner indicated that the amendment and remarks would likely overcome the prior art of record, since the prior art of record used in the rejections taught error detection but did not teach error correction. Specifically, the Examiner indicated that the arguments made by the undersigned have merit, however further examination and/or search is still required. This written response is thus, submitted in follow-up to the telephonic interview for consideration by the Examiner, as it is believed to have placed the application in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner send another Office Action based on new art, Applicants respectfully request

Application Serial No. 10/672,508
Attorney Docket No. 60001.0396US01/MS303915.1

another interview to determine what claim amendments would be sufficient for a notice of allowance.

I. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In the Final Office Action dated April 7, 2006, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-4 and 15-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over CAST Bobby: Manual for Downloadable Version 2000, (hereinafter "*Bobby*"), copyright 1996-2000 Center for Applied Special Technology (CAST), in view of Duggan et al. (hereinafter "*Duggan*"), U.S. Patent No. 6,002,871, issued December 1999. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claim 1 has been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment overcomes this rejection and adds no new matter.

Amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "correcting a definable error by presenting the analysis data to an application program." Support for the amendment can be found in the specification at least on page 10, lines 8-19.

In contrast, *Bobby* at least does not disclose correcting a definable error. For example, *Bobby* specifically states "Bobby only analyzes HTML but will let you know of potential issues with other objects." (See page 2, QuickStart) Consequently, because *Bobby*, states that it only analyzes HTML, *Bobby* cannot disclose correcting a definable error.

Furthermore, *Duggan* does not overcome *Bobby*'s deficiencies. *Duggan* merely discloses a testing tool for testing programs that are deployed on a server. (See Abstract.) In *Duggan*, at step 80, the core module checks to see if an error is detected by a client connection. (See col. 25, lines 38-40.) If at step 84, a determination is made that either a time-out error or an error was reported by the client connection, an error code identifying the type of error is stored in a variable denoted "Stat1." (See col. 25, line 66 – col. 26, line 2.) In *Duggan*, the error code identifying the error is written to "Stat2," overwriting any previous error codes. (See col. 26, lines 19-20.) Next, at step 108, the core module determines from the Stat2 variable that an error has been logged. (See col. 26, lines 25-26.) Finally, in *Duggan*, at step 110, a flag is set to indicate the presence of the error. (See col. 26, lines 26-28.) In *Duggan*, no further indication is

Application Serial No. 10/672,508
Attorney Docket No. 60001.0396US01/MS303915.1

given as to error correction. Consequently, in *Duggan*, correcting a definable error is not disclosed.

Combining *Bobby* with *Duggan* would not have lead to the claimed invention because *Bobby* and *Duggan*, either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose “correcting a definable error by presenting the analysis data presented to an application program,” as recited by amended Claim 1. Accordingly, independent Claim 1 patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Dependent Claims 2-4 and 15-20 are also allowable for at least the reasons described above regarding independent Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 2-4 and 15-20.

II. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In the Final Office Action, Claims 5-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) were rejected as being unpatentable over *Bobby* in view of Nentwich et al. (hereinafter “*Nentwich*”), xlinkit: A Consistency Checking and Smart Link Generation Service, ACM Transactions on Internet Technology, Vol. 2, No. 2, May 2002, p. 151-185. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claims 5, 9, 13 have been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment overcomes this rejection and adds no new matter.

Amended Claim 5 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, “presenting the analysis data to an application program to correct a definable error in the hypertext document.” Amended Claims 7, 9, and 13 each includes a similar recitation. Support for the amendments can be found in the specification at least on page 10, lines 8-19.

In contrast, *Bobby* at least does not disclose correcting a definable error in a hypertext document. For example, *Bobby* specifically states “*Bobby* only analyzes HTML but will let you know of potential issues with other objects.” (See page 2, QuickStart) Consequently, because *Bobby*, states that it only analyzes HTML, *Bobby* does not disclose correcting a definable error.

Furthermore, *Nentwich* does not overcome *Bobby*'s deficiencies. *Nentwich* merely discloses a consistency checking and smart link generation service. (See Overview.) In *Nentwich*, a user enters a URL of a document and a rule set to be checked. (See page 168,

Application Serial No. 10/672,508
Attorney Docket No. 60001.0396US01/MS303915.1

paragraph 3.) After parsing the document and the rule set, a servlet writes an XML file containing generated links to a web server. (See page 168; last paragraph – 169, first paragraph.) Finally, in *Nentwich*, the XML file can be translated into HTML using a stylesheet. (See page 169, first paragraph.) *Nentwich* writes the XML file which is then linked to HTML using stylesheets. Consequently, in *Nentwich*, correcting a definable error in a hypertext document is not disclosed because, *Nentwich* discloses using stylesheets to link XML files to HTML files.

Combining *Bobby* with *Nentwich* would not have lead to the claimed invention because *Bobby* and *Nentwich*, either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose “presenting the analysis data to an application program to correct a definable error in the hypertext document,” as recited by amended Claim 1. Amended Claims 9 and 17 each includes a similar recitation. Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 9, and 17 each patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Dependent Claims 6-8, 10-12, and 14 are also allowable for at least the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 5, 9, and 13. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 6-8, 10-12, and 14.

III. Conclusion


In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Office Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Action.

Application Serial No. 10/672,508
Attorney Docket No. 60001.0396US01/MS303915.1

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD, L.L.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(404) 954-5100


Murrell W. Blackburn
Reg. No. 50,881

Date: August 4, 2006

